

Atty Docket No.: IDF 1767
(4000-07000)

Patent

REMARKS

At the time of the office action of November 29, 2005, claims 1-18 were pending in this patent application.

Claims 1-10 and 12-17 were rejected.

Claims 11 and 18 were objected to.

Reconsideration of claims 1-18 is requested in view of the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-10 and 12-17 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Torrey et al. US Patent 6,466,799*. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* discloses in Fig. 3b, a method for notifying a user device (hand-held wireless communications device; telephonic device) coupled to an integrated services hub (call processing element) that communication has been terminated with a remote device, comprising:

receiving a disconnect signal from the remote device into the integrated services hub (355);

determining the status of the user device (360); and

when the user device is off-hook (365), relaying a call termination notification signal to the user device from the integrated services hub via a user device interface coupled to the user device (370; col. 6, lines 1-15).

Atty Docket No.: IDF 1767
(4000-07000)

Patent

The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of *Torrey*. *Torrey* teaches a system and method for completing a call between a cell phone in a customer's premises with one or more conventional telephonic devices in the same customer premises. Completing a call means connecting the devices at the beginning of a telephone call so that the telephone message may be transferred between the devices. It has nothing to do with terminating the call, that is disconnecting the devices.

An integrated services hub of the present invention is a device that connects on one side to a **remote device**, i.e. a device not located with the integrated services hub, and that connects on another side to one or more telephonic devices located near the integrated services hub. An integrated services hub generally connects signals between a telephone company central office (clearly not located at the customer's house) and a telephone at the customer's house.

The *Torrey* call processing element that the Examiner equates to a integrated services hub, is a device that couples signals between a cell phone at the location of the call processing element and one or more telephonic devices also located at the same location as the call processing element. *Torrey* does not teach or suggest any connection between its call processing element and a remote device.

As to the first element of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* teaches:
"receiving a disconnect signal from the remote device into the integrated services hub (355)"

The reference number 355 in Fig. 3B of *Torrey* refers to the step of "incoming call indication" which is shown in Fig. 3B to be a signal moving from the cell phone 200

Atty Docket No.: IDF 1767
(4000-07000)

Patent

to the call processing element 223. An incoming call indication is a signal requesting that a connection be made. It is not a disconnect signal. See *Torrey* Col. 6, lines 1-15.

The cell phone 200 is not a remote device. It is located with the call processing element 223. In Fig. 2A it is shown as actually sitting on or directly connected to the premises converter 220 in which the call processing element is located. They are both on the premises.

The Examiner has equated the term "user device" in the present claims with both a hand held wireless communication device and a telephonic device. If that is the case, then where is the remote device? *Torrey* teaches transferring signals between the two user devices that the Examiner has identified. There is no signal transfer with a remote device.

As to the second element of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* teaches:

"determining the status of the user device (360)"

The reference number 360 in Fig. 3B of *Torrey* refers to the step of "ring current" which is shown in Fig. 3B to be a signal moving from the call processing element 223 to the telephonic device, e.g. 231. Ring current causes the telephonic device to ring so that the user will know that an incoming call has been detected and the user can answer the phone by taking the telephonic device off hook, i.e. he can pick up the telephone. See *Torrey* Col. 6, lines 1-15. *Torrey* therefore teaches nothing about determining the status of the user device, but instead teaches causing the user device to ring.

Atty Docket No.: IDF 1767
(4000-07000)

Patent

As to the third element of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* teaches:

"when the user device is off-hook (365), relaying a call termination notification signal to the user device from the integrated services hub via a user device interface coupled to the user device (370; col. 6, lines 1-15)"

The reference number 365 in Fig. 3B of *Torrey* refers to the step of "off-hook indication" which is shown in Fig. 3B to be a signal moving from the telephonic device, e.g. 231, to the processing element 223. The reference number 370 in Fig. 3B of *Torrey* refers to the step of "call completion request" which is shown in Fig. 3B to be a signal moving from the processing element 223 to the cell phone 200. When these steps have occurred, "the call processing element connects the telephonic device to the hand-held wireless communications device as indicated by call completion 375." See *Torrey* Col. 6, lines 1-15. *Torrey* therefore teaches nothing about relaying a call termination notification signal from a remote device, but instead teaches transferring a call connection, i.e. completion, signal from a local device to a cell phone on the customer premises.

Torrey therefore teaches none of the elements of claim 1. *Torrey* has nothing to do with receiving any signal from a remote device, much less a disconnect signal. *Torrey* does not teach determining the status of a user device and relaying a call termination signal to the user device.

The Applicant submits that Claim 1 is clearly patentable over the *Torrey* reference. Since claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 2-10 are also patentable over the *Torrey* reference.

**Atty Docket No.: IDF 1767
(4000-07000)**

Patent

Regarding claim 12, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* discloses a method for defining the status of a user device upon termination of communication with a remote device comprising :

receiving a disconnect signal from the remote device (355);
determining the status of the user device via a CPU (260) monitoring a user device interface (200) coupled to the user device (231-235);
when the user device is off-hook, sending a call termination notification signal to the user device interface (370);
interpreting the call termination notification signal by the user device as notification for the user device to enter an on-hook status (column 4, lines 35-column 6, line 15); and
placing the user device interface in a standby state upon the placement of the user device in an on-hook status (column 4, line 35-column 6, line 15).

As to the first element of claim 12, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* teaches:
"receiving a disconnect signal from the remote device (355)."

The reference number 355 in Fig. 3B of *Torrey* refers to the step of "incoming call indication" which is shown in Fig. 3B to be a signal moving from the cell phone 200 to the call processing element 223. An incoming call indication is a signal requesting that a connection be made. It is not a disconnect signal. See *Torrey* Col. 6, lines 1-15. The cell phone 200 is not a remote device. It is connected directly to the premises converter 220.

Atty Docket No.: IDF 1767
(4000-07000)

Patent

As to the second element of claim 12, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* teaches:

"determining the status of the user device via a CPU (260) monitoring a user device interface (200) coupled to the user device (231-235)."

The Examiner has indicated that element 200 of *Torrey* is a user device interface. But device 200 is a cell phone which the Examiner indicated above was a user device. *Torrey* teaches a "telephonic interface" 268 that is coupled to the "telephonic devices 231, 232, 234, 235 over link 224." It is not coupled to the cell phone 200.

As to the third element of claim 12, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* teaches:

"when the user device is off-hook, sending a call termination notification signal to the user device interface (370)."

The reference number 370 in Fig. 3B of *Torrey* refers to the step of "call completion request" which is shown in Fig. 3B to be a signal moving from the processing element 223 to the cell phone 200. A call completion request instructs the device to complete a connection, not terminate a connection.

As to the fourth element of claim 12, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* teaches:

"interpreting the call termination notification signal by the user device as notification for the user device to enter an on-hook status (column 4, lines 35-column 6, line 15)."

The cited portion of *Torrey* does not discuss receiving a disconnect signal from a remote device. It does discuss a connection to the telephone network 290 which would

Atty Docket No.: IDF 1767
(4000-07000)

Patent

provide connections to remote devices. However, that network 290 is not connected in any way to the call processing element 223.

As to the fifth element of claim 12, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* teaches:

"placing the user device interface in a standby state upon the placement of the user device in an on-hook status (column 4, line 35-column 6, line 15)."

As noted above, *Torrey* teaches a telephonic interface 268. But, *Torrey* does not teach placing a user device interface in standby status.

Torrey therefore teaches none of the elements of claim 12. *Torrey* has nothing to do with receiving any signal from a remote device, much less a disconnect signal. *Torrey* does not teach determining the status of a user device and relaying a call termination signal to the user device.

The Applicant submits that Claim 12 is clearly patentable over the *Torrey* reference. Since claim 13 depends from claim 12, Applicant submits that claim 13 is also patentable over the *Torrey* reference.

Regarding claim 14, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* discloses in Figs. 2A-3B, an apparatus (223) for notifying a user device (200) coupled thereto that communication has been terminated with a remote device, comprising:

a network interface (220) configured for receiving a disconnect signal from the remote device (355) into the apparatus (223);

a CPU (260) coupled to the network interface and configured for determining the status of the user device (col. 4, lines 41-45); and

Atty Docket No.: IDF 1767
(4000-07000)

Patent

a user device interface (210) coupled to the user device (231-235) and the CPU (260) and configured for relaying a call termination notification signal from the CPU to the user device when the user device is off-hook (365). See col. 4, lines 35 – col. 6, line 15.

As to the first element of claim 14, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* teaches: "a network interface (220) configured for receiving a disconnect signal from the remote device (355) into the apparatus (223)."

It is possible that the overall apparatus 220 of *Torrey* could receive a disconnect signal from a remote device through telephone network 290. However, the apparatus 223 is not connected to the telephone network 290 and therefore cannot receive a disconnect signal from a remote device through the network 290. The reference number 355 is shown in Fig. 3A to be an "incoming call indication" flowing from the cell phone 200 to call processing element 223. Signal 355 is not a disconnect signal and is not from a remote device.

As to the second element of claim 14, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* teaches: "a CPU (260) coupled to the network interface and configured for determining the status of the user device (col. 4, lines 41-45)."

The Examiner has equated the cell phone 200 with the user device. There is no teaching in *Torrey* of determining the status of the cell phone.

**Atty Docket No.: IDF 1767
(4000-07000)**

Patent

As to the third element of claim 14, the Examiner asserts that *Torrey* teaches:
"a user device interface (210) coupled to the user device (231-235) and the CPU (260) and configured for relaying a call termination notification signal from the CPU to the user device when the user device is off-hook (365). See col. 4, lines 35 – col. 6, line 15."

The element 210 is a premises station, which as shown in Fig. 1B is simply a cradle with electrical contacts to provide direct electrical connection between the cell phone 200 and the call processing element 223. Element 210 is coupled to the cell phone 200, not to the wired telephones 231-235. The reference number 365 in Fig. 3B of *Torrey* refers to the step of "off-hook indication" which is shown in Fig. 3B to be a signal moving from the telephonic device, e.g. 231, to the processing element 223. It is part of the process for completing, i.e. connecting, a call between a wired telephone set, e.g. 231 and the cell phone 200. It has nothing to do with a call termination notification signal.

In view of these substantial differences, Applicant submits that claim 14 is patentable over *Torrey*. Since claims 15-17 depend from claim 14, Applicant submits that claims 15-17 are also patentable over *Torrey*.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claim 11 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since claims 11 and 18 depend from claims 1 and 14 respectively which have

**Atty Docket No.: IDF 1767
(4000-07000)**

Patent

been shown to be patentable above, Applicant submits that claims 11 and 18 should be allowable as dependent claims.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicant requests allowance of claims 1-18.

Atty Docket No.: IDF 1767
(4000-07000)

Patent

CONCLUSION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

Respectfully submitted,

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

Date: 2-14-06

5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330
Plano, Texas 75024
Telephone: (972) 731-2288
Facsimile: (972) 731-2289

Albert C. Metrailler

Albert C. Metrailler
Reg. No. 27,145

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS